

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/790,725	03/03/2004	Jone Chang	2450-0643P	2633
2292 7	590 03/29/2006		EXAM	INER
	VART KOLASCH & BI	ORTIZ, ANGELA Y		
PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1732	

DATE MAILED: 03/29/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/790,725	CHANG, JONE				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Angela Ortiz	1732				
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	th the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stany reply received by the Office later than three months after the mearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	B DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a control of the community of	CATION. reply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status		•				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 0.	3 March 2004.					
·- ·						
3) Since this application is in condition for allo	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under	er <i>Ex parte Quayl</i> e, 1935 C.D). 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims	·					
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are without 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	drawn from consideration.					
Application Papers	•					
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Exam 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 03 March 2004 is/ar Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the cor 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	e: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ ob the drawing(s) be held in abeyar rection is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International But * See the attached detailed Office action for a	ents have been received. Lents have been received in Appriority documents have been reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB	Paper No(Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	_				

Application/Control Number: 10/790,725

Art Unit: 1732

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anstadt et al., USP 4,141,944.

The cited reference substantially teaches the basic claimed process of molding a foam material into a desired form (col. 2, lines 25-30) such that the surface of the form has minute cavities formed therein, providing a heated embossing tool (col. 6, lines 55-60), and embossing a desired pattern in the surface of the foamed material. As the heated device enters the surface of the foamed material, the foamed material is melted and cavities or furrows are formed. These cavities or furrows form a relief pattern of desired design. See col. 6, lines 45-68; col. 7, lines 1-15.

Application/Control Number: 10/790,725

Art Unit: 1732

The cited reference does not teach a sponge per se.

Note that sponges are made of foamed materials, and readable on any foamed material disclosed. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make a sponge using the method steps set forth in the applied reference, as consideration of the reference is not limited to its preferred embodiment, but extends to the molding of any conventional product including sponges.

With respect to claim 2, the pattern formed is well within the choice of the practitioner; note that the reference does set forth embossing in select pores to form a desired pattern, see col. 2, lines 59-68.

With respect to claims 3-5, the shape of the embossing tool is not shown in the applied reference; however, such is conventional in the art, and within the choice of the practitioner.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. USP's 2190376; 2590983; 3390403; 3904557; 4304747; 5066531; 5993708 (heated tool and foam article); Jap. Ref. 6-238597.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Angela Ortiz whose telephone number is 571-272-1206. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 9:00-6:30.

Application/Control Number: 10/790,725 Page 4

Art Unit: 1732

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Colaianni can be reached on 571-272-1196. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Angela Ortiz
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1732